

REMARKS

Claims 1-32, all the claims pending in the application, stand rejected. No claims are amended.

New Grounds of Rejection

The Examiner found Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-32, as submitted in the response filed on May 30, 2008, to be convincing. Thus, the Examiner has performed a further search and has cited a new prior art reference to Rankin (U.S. 2002/0135515) as the base reference in formulating new ground(s) of rejection.

Notwithstanding the citation of new art, the rejections have been made “final,” thus precluding further amendment of the claims without the filing of an RCE. This is proper under US practice since the claims were amended in the previous response.

Nonetheless, based upon Applicants' review of the new reference, Applicants strongly believe that there are substantive arguments, as presented below and based upon existing claim language, that demonstrate the patentability of the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (2002/0135515). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1

With respect to claim 1, and with reference to the preferred embodiment in Fig. 1 of the present application, the invention concerns a multi-language communication method for environments having a large number of participants, speaking multiple languages, such as aircraft, ships, trains, seminars, or the like. All participants are confined to a single venue, but are individually identified by a respective location (e.g. a seat) in that venue. Thus, a key to the claimed method is the feature that each participant has “**a respective identifiable location.**” For an environment such as an aircraft, ship or train, each participant would have an assigned seat in that venue.

The communication method, as claimed, directs the communication in a particular language allocated to the participant based upon the **identifiable location.** Specifically, the claim states in the preamble that the method is:

“...for providing concurrently communications in at least one of a plurality of selectable languages from a source to each of a plurality of persons having respective identifiable locations.”

Each of the four steps that comprise limitations in the body of the claim directly ties the recited step to the respective identifiable locations of each person:

1. Electronically providing to each of said persons at a respective identifiable location access to a plurality of language options;
2. Electronically receiving from each of one or more of said persons an indication of a respective choice of language chosen by said respective person from said language options for said respective identifiable location;
3. Storing said language choices in a database in conjunction with said respective identifiable locations; and
4. Making said language choices accessible by one or more applications so that said applications can when operated selectively provide output to each respective person in the respective language choice at said respective identifiable location.

The recited method clearly and unambiguously relates to a customized system that directly assigns language choices to specific seats or locations in a particular venue. The claim permits each person to specify the language that is to be used at that location for announcements and other communications.

Rankin

The Examiner asserts that Rankin suggests a multi-language communication method “for concurrently providing communications in at least one of a plurality of selectable languages from a source to each of a plurality of persons having respective identifiable locations.” The Examiner looks primarily to the text in paragraph [0029] for relevant teachings. However, Applicants would respectfully assert that there is NO teaching of communications based upon respective identifiable locations in a common venue.

Communications Are NOT Based On Respective Identifiable Locations of Users

With reference to Fig. 1 and the explanation at paragraph [0084] of Rankin, the system on a vehicle platform 100 has a transport beacon 102 that communicates with one or more user terminals 104 via a data stream 110. The user terminals may be any of a mobile phone, PDA and

laptop PC, as explained at paragraph [0012]. The transport beacon 102 receives data related to the geographical position of the platform 100 (not the location of an individual user on the platform) and broadcasts position-related advertising or messages to plural users, without regard to the respective identifiable location of each user.

While data may be customized for an individual user on the vehicle platform, based upon the disclosure in paragraph [0029] of Rankin, the delivery is not based upon an identifiable location of each user on the vehicle platform.

As emphasized in the claim limitations reproduced above, the several steps requiring activity with respect to “respective identifiable locations” of users in a common venue are not taught in Rankin.

Languages Are NOT Selected and Communicated by Users

Rankin does not teach a selection and indication of a respective language by a user, as required by step 2 above. In addition, Rankin does not teach storage of the language choice of a user “in conjunction with said respective identifiable locations,” as required by step 3 above. Rankin only teaches in paragraph [0029] the broadcasting of “public address or news announcements in different user-terminal selectable languages.” This text clearly teaches a broadcast in several languages with selection of the one of several language announcements at the receiver. This text teaches nothing more than changing channels to pick up one of plural concurrently broadcast messages. There is no teaching of a selective transmission from a source to each user in a selected language at a common venue.

The interactive communication between users and a common source on a , where languages that are used in communications to a respective identifiable location, is simply not taught in Rankin.

Communications Between Basestation and Transport Platform Are NOT Relevant

In the Examiner’s analysis, reference is made to the communication between a basestation beacon and a transport beacon in geographical locations, where advertising or the like can be provided to the transport beacon based on the geographical location of the transport platform. The Examiner appears to assert that a single transport platform has an identifiable location and meets the claim language.

This analysis is flawed, since the communication between basestation and transport platform is not a communication with “persons having respective identifiable locations.” The clear import of the language of the claim is that each person using the system has a respective identifiable location. The word “respective” is clearly being used in the claim to distinguish one user with respect to other users, not one vehicle or venue with respect to other vehicles or venues.

Language Choices Are Not Stored In Conjunction With Respective Identifiable Locations

The Examiner refers to paragraph [0029] and states “base station receives preference from user terminals in order to transmit information in user-terminal-selectable languages.” This is not correct. There is no teaching of an individual user choice being sent to a basestation and stored with respect to a particular location of the user in a common venue. According to the teachings in the cited paragraph, as would be understood by one skilled in the art, the base station simply broadcasts the same message in plural languages and the user locally selects the one to be received. There is no storage of a language selection taught in Rankin, even at the transport platform.

The Examiner also asserts that Rankin discloses making said language choices accessible by one or more applications and refers again to paragraph [0029], stating “public address, news announcements, and adverts are provided in the chosen language, [0033] in response to present geographical location.” Again, this is not correct since there are no “applications” made available by such public broadcasts. As noted previously, the adverts are broadcast in plural languages and provided in a desired language at the local selection of a channel by the user.

Claim 22

The claim is also directed to a multi-language communication method and is specifically limited by the preamble to passengers on a vehicle where each of the plurality of passengers has “respective identifiable locations.” The steps that comprise limitations in the body of the claim directly tie the recited step to the respective identifiable locations of each person. Specifically, the claim requires:

electronically receiving from each of one or more of said persons an indication of a respective choice of language chosen by said respective person from said

language options for delivery at a respective *identifiable location*; and

providing to each of said passengers who has chosen a language access to content in his or her respective language of choice at a respective *identifiable location*.

Rankin

The clear import of the language in the claim is that the delivery of a message from a source is (1) in a language chosen by each passenger and (2) to the respective *identifiable location* of each of plural passengers in a common venue. Again, Rankin does not teach the assignment and provision of language messages to passengers on the basis of a respective identifiable location.

Claims 2-5, 7, 12, 13, 17, 20, 21, 23-26, and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (2002/0135515) in view of Poch (5,152, 003). This rejection should be traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 2

This claim depends from claim 1 and would be patentable for reasons already given for claim 1. The Examiner also admits that “Rankin does not specifically mention those of said persons who do not choose a language are assigned a language choice being a principal language.” The Examiner looks to Poch for such teaching at col. 2-3 lines 59-10. Poch is not relied upon for any other teachings related to other limitations in the claim.

Poch

Poch is significantly different from the present invention, as asserted in detail in the previous response, and the Examiner does not deny that there is:

- **No** identifiable location for patrons;
- **No** automated translation capability;
- **No** language selectable by and separately deliverable to individual participants;
- **No** concurrent public announcements;
- **No** interactive communication with translation both ways; and
- **No** combined live and pre-recorded announcements.

In short, the system disclosed in Poch is not for an aircraft or similar environment where multiple patrons are assigned a specific seat or other identifiable location, nor does it have a

customized language choice on the basis of a language selection by the patron. Further, there is no translation capability, concurrent public announcement, interactive communication or automated assignment of language to a particular unit. A new language is reselected and reassigned to a given unit by a programmer, not the user.

The claim and its parent are patentable over the combination of Rankin and Poch.

Claim 3

This claim depends from claim 1 and would be patentable for reasons already given for claim 1. The Examiner looks to Poch for a teaching at col. 2-3 lines 59-10 that a principle language may be used. Poch is not relied upon for any other teachings related to other limitations in the claim.

The claim and its parent are patentable over the combination of Rankin and Poch.

Claim 4

This claim depends from claim 1 and would be patentable for reasons already given for claim 1.

Claim 5

Claim 5 is independent and recites a multi-language communication method for making an announcement concurrently, where, like in claim 1, there are “a plurality of persons having respective identifiable locations.” Clearly, this language defines an environment where each person at a common venue receives an announcement at his respective location, and in a language that she selects. Specifically, each person provides an electronic indication of a language preference and that selection is “received.”

Rankin

In Rankin, only a “user terminal selectable” switch is used to select one of several concurrent broadcasts of the same message in several languages. Nothing is “received,” especially by a source unit sending the message.

Also, there is no personal announcement over a respective personal address system in a respective language of choice. Instead, the announcement is broadcast universally and a simple channel selection is made by a given user. This is not a “personal address system” as disclosed and claimed.

Finally, there is no access by each person via a personal announcement over a respective personal address system at a respective identifiable location. As already noted several times, in Rankin there is no “respective identifiable location” for each person at a common venue.

The Examiner admits that Rankin does not specifically mention a principal language and looks to Poch for a disclosure of a principal language at col. 2-3 lines 59-10. Poch is not relied upon for any other purpose.

As already noted, Rankin is clearly distinguishable from the claimed invention and Poch does not remedy those deficiencies.

Claim 7

Claim 7 depends from claim 5 and would be patentable for reasons already given.

Moreover, the Examiner admits that Rankin does not specifically mention that the personal announcement comprises a prerecorded audio translation of the announcement in the respective language choice of a respective person, played over one or more personal loudspeakers located proximate said respective person. The Examiner looks to Poch for a disclosure of a “prerecorded audio translation of an announcement in a respective language choice of a respective person,” based upon the teachings in Fig 2 and at col. 3 lines 65-67.

As Poch does not remedy the basic difference between the claimed invention relative to the provision of messages in different languages to a respective person at a respective identifiable location, the claim would be patentable.

Claim 12

Claim 12 depends from claim 5 and would be patentable for reasons already given for that claim.

Further, the Examiner admits that Rankin does not specifically mention making an announcement available to each of the persons who has not indicated a language choice in the form of a personal announcement over a personal address system in the principal language. The Examiner looks to Poch for a teaching of a personal announcement over a personal address system in said principal language at col. 2-3 lines 59-10.

First, the announcement in Poch is a broadcast and not personal. Second, nothing in Poch remedies the deficiencies in Rankin, as already explained.

Claim 13

Claim 13 is independent and recites a multi-language communication system with a “database for storing a respective language choice of each of said persons on the basis of said respective identifiable location.” The three emphasized limitations are not found in Rankin.

First, there is no database in the basestation of Rankin that stores language choices. Rankin mentions that the “transport beacon may incorporate storage for data related to a geographical position along the route of the transportation platform and for user data within the transport beacon.” However, this does not teach a correlation among choices of persons using the system relevant to the claim. In particular, there is no storage of any choice of languages by a user. The announcements are broadcast in multiple languages from a source and the user merely selects the language to be received. Finally, there are no respective identifiable locations for each user. The Examiner again erroneously refers to the beacon and the geographically-based transmissions made to the moving vehicle platform. However, this transmission is not based upon each user, but based upon each vehicle, which contains multiple users. Thus, there is no “respective identifiable location” for each person, the limitation in the claim clearly relating to separate locations for each person.

Also, there is no “plurality of personal address systems, each for making said announcement available to a respective person in the form of a personal announcement in the respective language choice of that respective person at a respective identifiable location” The Examiner’s reference to paragraph [0029] of Rankin is unavailing as this simply relates to public concurrent broadcasts of the same message in plural languages. Such arrangement does not meet the limitation requiring “respective” and individual relationships of a person to the address system, the messages, the languages and the locations.

Finally, there is no “control system operable to select each of said personal announcements on the basis of said public announcement and said language choices, and to direct select each of said personal announcements to the corresponding personal address system of each respective person at a respective identifiable location.” On the basis of the limited

teachings in paragraph [0029], Rankin simply teaches a broadcast of signals with the selection of language made by a user by tuning a receiver or channel selector.

The Examiner admits that Rankin does not specifically mention a principal language. The Examiner looks to Poch solely for such teaching. As already demonstrated, Poch does not remedy the basic deficiencies in Rankin. Thus, the claim would be patentable over the combination of the two references.

Claim 17

This claim would be patentable because of its dependence from claim 13. Moreover, the limitations of the claim related to “respective” choices, languages and locations would not be met by the combination of Rankin and Poch.

Claim 20

The Examiner admits that Rankin does not specifically mention “a console having a display and a data entry device for each of said persons for providing said language options to each of said persons and to allow each respective person to select said language option.” The Examiner looks to Poch for such teaching at col. 7 lines 58-69. The Examiner also asserts that it would be obvious “to provide language options to each of said persons and to allow each respective person to select said language option, in order to allow convenient access for reprogramming,” based upon the teachings in Poch at col. 8 lines 7-9.

The cited language relates to selecting one of several frequencies by a given unit, where each frequency relates to a different language. This claim would be patentable because of its dependence from claim 13.

Claim 21

With respect to claim 21, which depends from claim 13, the Examiner admits that Rankin does not specifically mention “a console having a display and a data entry device for each of said persons, each of said consoles providing access to a plurality of predefined service request options, so that each of said persons can request the corresponding service by means of said console.” The Examiner looks to Poch for such teaching at col. 7 lines 58-69.

This claim would be patentable for reasons given for parent claim 13.

Claim 23

With respect to claim 23, the Examiner admits that Rankin does not specifically mention providing to each of said passengers who has not chosen a language access to content in a principal language, and looks to Poch for such teaching.

This claim would be patentable for reasons given for parent claim 22.

Claim 24

This claim would be patentable for reasons given for parent claim 22.

Claim 25

With respect to claim 25, the Examiner asserts that Rankin discloses “providing at least one announcement to each of said passengers by means of a personal address system, wherein said announcement is in the respective language of choice of each passenger” because in paragraph [0033], Rankin is “transmitting to user terminals, thereby making it a personal announcement in the chosen language.” The term “personal announcement” has been improperly broadened by the Examiner, beyond any reasonable interpretation on the basis of common usage and the teachings in the specification of the present application. The phrase clearly relates to a targeted, one-on-one transmission and not a broadcast, which is the only communication contemplated by Rankin.

The claim would be patentable for reasons given for its parent claim 22 and because there is no teaching of personal announcements in Rankin.

Claim 26

Claim 26 is independent and is directed to a multi-language communication system. The claim clearly relates to a system requiring individual and customized transmissions from a source to individual receivers at respective unique locations. The communications on individual paths are concurrent for all passengers and in selectable languages. The selectable languages are sent separately from a source and are targeted to each of a plurality of passengers having respective identifiable locations.

Rankin

As previously asserted by Applicants, the teachings in paragraph [0029] are not relevant and, in particular, transmissions from a basestation beacon of public address announcements in

different user-terminal-selectable languages to different transport platforms does not meet the claim limitations.

Further, Rankin does not teach a database at a source location for storing a respective language choice of each of said passengers on the basis of respective identifiable locations. Neither the basestation nor the transport beacon store a database with language choices of individual users.

Also, there is no “control system operable to retrieve said language choices from said database and operable to provide each of said passengers with access to content in his or her respective language of choice.” As already noted, there is no database and control system operable on the basis of any data base for providing passengers with a personalized message in a language of choice. The user simply switches channels to pick one of plural concurrently transmitted messages.

Lastly, the Examiner admits that Rankin does not specifically mention if no language was chosen by a respective passenger, providing in a principal language. The Examiner looks to Poch solely for this feature at col. 2-3 lines 59-10.

The claim would be patentable for reasons given above, as Poch does not remedy the deficiencies of Rankin.

Claim 28

With respect to claim 28, the claim would be patentable for reasons given for parent claim 26.

Claim 29

With respect to claim 29, the claim would be patentable for reasons given for parent claim 26.

Claim 30

With respect to claim 30, the claim would be patentable for reasons given for parent claim 26.

Claim 31

With respect to claim 31, the claim would be patentable for reasons given for parent claim 26.

Claims 6, 16, 27, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (2002/0135515) in view of Poch (5,152,003), in further view of Li et al. (6,205,418).

Claims 6, 16, and 27

The Examiner admits that Rankin and Poch do not specifically mention “making said respective language choices accessible by an attendant so that said attendant can anticipate the language needs of a respective person.” The Examiner looks to Li for such disclosure, particularly in the abstract and at col. , lines 13-15.

These claims would be patentable by virtue of their dependency from allowable parent claims.

Claim 32

With respect to claim 32, the Examiner admits that Rankin and Poch do not specifically mention “the system is operable to receive said language choices from an operator who has received the respective language choices from one or more of the passengers.” The Examiner looks to Li for such teaching.

This claim would be patentable for reasons given for claim 6 above, and because of its dependence on allowable claim 26.

Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (2002/0135515) in view of Poch (5,152,003), in further view of Glenn (6,434,518).

Claim 8

This claim depends from claim 5, but the Examiner admits that Rankin and Poch do not specifically mention that “the personal announcement is accessible by means of a headphone or ear-piece output allocated to said respective person, whereby said respective person can access

said personal announcement by means of a headset connected to said output.” The Examiner looks to Glenn for a disclosure relevant to this feature.

Glenn does not remedy the deficiencies of Rankin or Poch, and is cited for limited purposes. Thus, this claim would be patentable for reasons already given for parent claim 5.

Claim 10

This claim depends from claim 5, but the Examiner admits that Rankin and Poch do not specifically mention “said personal announcement comprises a prerecorded text translation of said announcement in the language choice of a respective person, accessible by means of a display allocated to said respective person, whereby said respective person can read said personal announcement on said display.” The Examiner looks to Glenn for a disclosure relevant to this feature.

Glenn does not remedy the deficiencies of Rankin or Poch, and is cited for limited purposes. Thus, this claim would be patentable for reasons already given for parent claim 5.

Claims 9, 11, 14, 15, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (2002/0135515) in view of Poch (5,152,003), in further view of Kumano (5,978,754).

Claims 9 and 11

These claims depend from claim 5, but the Examiner admits that Rankin and Poch do not specifically mention ”real-time translation of a text announcement and making said personal announcement accessible by means of a display allocated to said respective person, whereby said respective person can read said personal announcement on said display.” The Examiner looks to Kumano for a disclosure of “textual real-time translation, (Col 5 lines 25-30), and making the translation accessible by means of a display, whereby a person can read the translation on said display (Fig 1, translated sentence display section 107).”

Kumano does not remedy the deficiencies of Rankin or Poch, and is cited for limited purposes. Thus, this claim would be patentable for reasons already given for parent claim 5.

Moreover, the multi-language feature of Rankin does not depend on translation, but is based upon pre-recorded public announcements concurrently in several languages. This system

would be incompatible with, or at least would not need, the translation capability of Kumano. Further, for text messages, the local device being a personal PDA, PC or the like would not have such capability as part of the system contemplated by Rankin.

Claim 14

This claim depends from claim 13, but the Examiner admits that Rankin and Poch do not specifically mention " a real-time translation module for providing any one or more of: text to text, text to voice, voice to voice, and voice to text real- time translation, so that said system can provide real-time translations of said announcement." The Examiner looks to Kumano for a disclosure of "real-time translation module for providing text to text real- time translation."

Kumano does not remedy the deficiencies of Rankin or Poch, and is cited for limited purposes. Thus, this claim would be patentable for reasons already given for parent claim 13.

Claim 15

This claim depends from claim 13, but the Examiner admits that Rankin and Poch do not specifically mention " said module comprises a server provided with real-time translation software." The Examiner looks to Kumano for a disclosure of a "module [that] comprises a server provided with real-time translation software (Fig 1, Col 5 lines 25-30)."

Kumano does not remedy the deficiencies of Rankin or Poch, and is cited for limited purposes. Thus, this claim would be patentable for reasons already given for parent claim 13.

Claims 18 and 19

These claims depend from claim 13, but the Examiner admits that Rankin and Poch do not specifically mention " a personal announcement comprises a prerecorded audio translation of an announcement in a respective language choice of a respective person, played over one or more personal loudspeakers located proximate said respective person." The Examiner looks to Kumano for a disclosure of "real-time translation module (Col 5 lines 25-30)."

Kumano does not remedy the deficiencies of Rankin or Poch, and is cited for limited purposes. Thus, this claim would be patentable for reasons already given for parent claim 13.

Conclusion

In sum, the basic system and method approach of Rankin is clearly different from that of the present invention. Those differences are based upon the lack of any “respective” relationship among users, languages and terminals.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Alan J. Kasper/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Alan J. Kasper
Registration No. 25,426

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 25, 2009